reform agenda, engage appropriately with the West and eschew regional conflict.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, we as Americans have a responsibility to live up to our own ideals. How can we preach democracy, yet shun the free and fair choices of Egyptians? Of course, we cannot be naive. We have to recognize that democracy is about more than just elections, but also about protecting minority rights and building institutions that outlast the individuals who occupy them.

But we also have to recognize that supporting only democracies around the world that produce our own preferred results is the height of hypocrisy. On a more practical level, compromising our own values would only strengthen the hands of anti-Western fundamentalists. Refusing to engage with the Muslim Brotherhood would simply achieve a self-fulfilling prophecy by giving rise to extremists over reformists and moderates.

No country following decades of authoritarian rule can make a full transition to a thriving, stable, peaceful and prosperous democracy quickly and painlessly. Even with the most optimistic of outlooks, the Egyptian people will struggle for years to come to throw off the shackles of the past and create the kind of future for which we all strive. We have been working at this for 236 years, Mr. Speaker, and we still haven't gotten it exactly right.

We have a responsibility, as longtime Egyptian allies and as champions of democracy around the globe, to stand with them in this process, encouraging continued reform and providing our support for the development of real democracy in the Arab world's most populous nation.

HONORING AMERICA'S VETERANS AND CARING FOR CAMP LEJEUNE FAMILIES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Honoring America's Veterans and Caring for Camp Lejeune Families Act, which the House will consider later today, especially title I, the Janey Ensminger Act.

Title I and a similar House bill honor a 9-year-old girl who died from child-hood leukemia, most likely because she was exposed to contaminated drinking water at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, when her mother was pregnant with her.

And by honoring Janey Ensminger, we honor those Americans who have shown remarkable determination to make their government do the right thing. They have struggled for more than a decade to learn exactly what chemicals were in the drinking water at Camp Lejeune, water that perhaps a million marines and their families

were exposed to over a 30-year period, to learn the health effects of exposure to the contaminated drinking water, and to seek justice for those harmed.

They took on their own government, including the Marine Corps they had served and to which they are still loyal, but which has been shamefully reluctant to accept responsibility for the water contamination.

Janey's father, Jerry Ensminger, is a retired marine who lived with his family on base at Camp Lejeune for a time. Jerry watched his daughter become ill from leukemia, struggle with the disease, and eventually lose the struggle. Years after he watched his daughter die, Jerry learned of the water contamination at Camp Lejeune and has not rested since.

I first met Jerry 4 years ago when he testified powerfully on the Science and Technology Committee's Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, which I then chaired. Jerry worked shoulder to shoulder with others, including Tom Townsend, Mike Partain, Jim Fontella, the Byron family and William Hill against long odds.

\sqcap 1220

The Janey Ensminger Act is the result of their remarkable efforts. They were always faithful to the cause of justice for those harmed by the contaminated drinking water.

The Janey Ensminger Act will require the VA to provide medical coverage for certain illnesses to veterans who served at Camp Lejeune between 1957 and 1987, and to their families. The VA will be the "payer of last resort." Justice requires no less for the people harmed by the water contamination at Camp Lejeune.

The harm will never be fully made right. The bill will not help Janey or her father. But the Janey Ensminger Act acknowledges responsibility and provides needed treatment for many others.

The marines who have championed this legislation served our democracy when they wore our Nation's uniform, and they served our democracy by their determination to obtain justice for the people harmed by the toxic drinking water at Camp Lejeune.

THE POLITICS OF FAIRNESS—I.E., THE POLITICS OF FAVORITISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about fairness from the President lately. Perhaps his Chicago advisers think that if he distracts, divides, and creates envy all in the name of so-called "fairness," Americans will ignore their thin wallets and stacked up bills. But the people are smarter than back-room government policycrats.

If the President is reelected in January, he will have inherited a weak economy from his predecessor—him-

self. Then who will he blame? The President was elected to solve problems, not place blame and make excuses for failure.

Like most Americans, I want the administration to succeed, but the evidence is not on the administration's side. With unemployment higher than 8 percent for 41 months—even higher for recent college graduates at above 50 percent—and our deficit above \$15 trillion, there isn't much of a record to stand on.

So we are involved in a new Madison Avenue campaign diversion called "Remake America" to make America "fair." Of course, fairness is in the eyes of the beholder, and it means different things to different folks; but it certainly sounds good at first glance.

Mr. Speaker, let's look at this idea. The politics of "fairness" are used when politicians want you to ignore their record and then claim that some people just haven't been treated fairly. This is a mere diversion from failed policy, failed ideas. When you look at the record, you'll see that this administration's definition of "fairness" really means "favoritism."

There is no fairness in crony capitalism. That is favoritism. There is no fairness in a perpetual bailout culture where the omnipotent government deems some too big to fail and others too small to succeed. That is favoritism. There is no fairness in forcing Americans to fork over money to pay for failed pet endeavors like Solyndra. That is favoritism. There is no fairness in an unaccountable government that constantly takes money from the working people and squanders it in a failed stimulus-or two. That is favoritism. And there is no fairness in enforcing some laws while proudly ignoring other laws. That is favoritism.

What this "fairness" debate—or the politics of favoritism—achieves is a systematic desire by government to create animosity—animosity towards those who have or are just trying to achieve some success. It also creates animosity toward government from those who built it on their own without being a member of the government's favored class.

This debate degrades the American Dream because it removes the equality of opportunity and creates a class of favorites—the class of government "friends."

There is no equality or fairness in forced equal outcomes. Since some people are more successful than others, to paraphrase Lincoln, the government, which cannot make everyone rich, is trying to accomplish what it can do—make everyone poor and dependent on the government for success. This is fairness? I think not.

Instead of encouraging individuals to succeed on their own, this administration tells citizens that they need the government. In fact, according to The Wall Street Journal, almost 50 percent of the population lives in a household where at least one member receives a government benefit.